

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SAMUEL CABASSA,

Plaintiff,

-against-

9:08-CV-480 (LEK/DEP)

JOSEPH T. SMITH,

Defendants.

DECISION and ORDER

This matter comes before the Court following a Report-Recommendation filed on February 22, 2011 by the Honorable David E. Peebles, United States Magistrate Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and L.R. 72.3 of the Northern District of New York. Report-Rec. (Dkt. No. 57). After fourteen days from the service thereof, the Clerk has sent the entire file to the undersigned, including the objections by Samuel Cabassa, which were filed on March 10, 2011. Objections (Dkt. No. 58).

This Court is to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). “A [district] judge . . . may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” *Id.* Where, however, an objecting “party makes only conclusory or general objections, or simply reiterates his original arguments, the Court reviews the Report and Recommendation only for clear error.” *Farid v. Bouey*, 554 F. Supp. 2d 301, 307 (N.D.N.Y. 2008) (quoting *McAllan v. Von Essen*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 672, 679 (S.D.N.Y. 2007) (citations and quotations omitted); see also *Brown v. Peters*, No. 95-CV-1641, 1997 WL 599355, at

*2-3 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 22, 1997). “A [district] judge . . . may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Court has considered the Objections and has undertaken a *de novo* review of the record and has determined that the Report-Recommendation should be approved for the reasons stated therein.

Accordingly, it is hereby


ORDERED, that the Report-Recommendation (Dkt. No. 58) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** in its **ENTIRETY**; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 48) is **GRANTED**, and that Plaintiff’s Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) is **DISMISSED** in its entirety; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk serve a copy of this Order on all parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 22, 2011
Albany, New York



Lawrence E. Kahn
U.S. District Judge